

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/750,442	12/31/2003	Raymond A. Failor	PTT.P.22	1769	
7590 03/04/2005			EXAMINER		
Ray L. Weber			GROSZ, ALEXANDER		
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber First National Tower, Fourth Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Akron, OH 44308-1456			3673	-	
			DATE MAILED: 03/04/2009	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/750,442	FAILOR ET AL.	۱)			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	 			
		Alexander Grosz	3673	\			
Dariad fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica			ess			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any earn	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communice period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutore to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, ation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimur y period will apply and will expire SIX (by statute, cause the application to bed	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comione ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	munication.			
Status		212112		-			
	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	n 16171,03					
2a)∐	•	This action is non-final.					
3)∐	· 						
	closed in accordance with the practice	under <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 193	5 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)[💢	Claim(s) <u>-19</u> is/are pending in the ap	polication.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)[💢	☑ Claim(s) <u>-19</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.					
	D) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on ☑3//0²/s/are: a) ☑ accepted or b) □ objected to by the Examiner.						
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. Note the att	ached Office Action or form PTO	<i>)</i> -152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have been receive	d. ,				
	2. Certified copies of the priority do						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of t	•		tage .			
* /	application from the International	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
7 3	See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certified copie	s not received.				
Attachmer	• •						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO		rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date				
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO	D/SB/08) 5) ☐ Not	ice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-1 er:	52)			

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

1. Claims 1-17, 19, drawn to medical chair, classified in class 5, subclass 618.

II. Claim 18, drawn to a medical procedure, classified in class 5, subclass 1. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the medical chair of group I can be used to support a patient in various positions, for surgery or merely rest.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

If applicant elects the medical chair of group I, then an election of species will apply.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the species of a medical chair with a pivotable pushbar; the species of a medical chair with a pivotable foot rest; and the species of a medical chair with a rotatable seat section.

Art Unit: 3673

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Mr. Weber on 2/25/05 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

In a brief conversation on 2/25/05, Mr. Weber indicated that in response to this action he will consider submitting claims which identify each and every element of the claims with reference to the drawings, with numerals in parentheses. Such numerals will aid in more easily "following" the claims and will help in avoiding "mistakes" but will not in any way limit the scopes of the claims.

Mr. Weber also indicated that he will consider submitting prior art relating to medical chairs with radiolucent back portions.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Alex Grosz at telephone number 703-308-2498.

Grosz/vs March 2, 2005

ALEXANDER OROSZ PRIMARY EXAMINER